

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/798,137 Examiner James O. Hansen	Applicant(s) KILLINGER ET AL. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Art Unit 3637</td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table>	Art Unit 3637	
Art Unit 3637				

All Participants:

(1) James O. Hansen.

(2) Mr. Jeremy Kriegel #39,257.

Date of Interview: 14 February 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 11-16, 23 & 24

Claims discussed:
claims of record

Prior art documents discussed:
Previous art of record including Manos et al., & Feldhahn. New citation to Schuh et al., was made of record for the teaching of a container having depressions along a rim for accepting pivots in a container lid.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/James O. Hansen/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In an effort to expedite the prosecution of the application process [compact prosecution], the examiner contacted applicant and proposed amendments to the claims [basically, incorporating the limitations of claim 4 into claim 1, and incorporating the limitations of claim 21 into claim 13] so as to place the application in condition for allowance. After further search, review and consideration, the examiner outlined a pending non-final office action [in view of the reopen prosecution notice mailed 12/6/07] utilizing Manos et al., in view of Schuh et al., and Manos et al., in view of Feldhahn. It was determined that claims 4 & 21 would be objected to if an action was put forth. Claims 25-27 were deemed allowable. Accordingly, applicant agreed to the proposed changes in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Claims 11 & 23 were amended to coincide with their respective base claims - see attached examiner's amendment.